

BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT CONFERENCE REPORT

SUBJECT: Monthly SHPO-FHWA-ACOE-NHDOT Cultural Resources Meeting

DATE OF CONFERENCES: November 7 & 14, 2013

LOCATION OF CONFERENCE: John O. Morton Building

ATTENDED BY:

NHDOT

John Butler
Sheila Charles
Victoria Chase
Ron Crickard
Jill Edelmenn
Cathy Goodmen
Robert Hudson
Tom Jameson
Ron Kleiner
Bob Landry
Marc Laurin
Steve Liakos
Karen Malburne
Michelle Marshall
Kevin Nyhan
Christine Perron
Nancy Spaulding
Trent Zanes

**Federal Highway
Administration**

Cassandra Chase
Jamie Sikora

NHDHR

Laura Black
Edna Feighner

**Portsmouth
Historical Society**

Richard Candee

Albacore Park

Ken Herrick

City of Concord

Martha Drukker
Becky Hebert
Stephen Henninger
Ed Roberge

City of Hanover

Peter Kulbacki
Don Ware

City of Manchester

Todd Connors
Tim Clougherty
Bruce Thomas

City of Portsmouth

Juliet Walker

CHA

Rob Faulkner

CLD

JoAnn Fryer
Kelsey Gagnon
Heidi Marshall

Dartmouth College

Joanna Whitcomb

DRC

Aaron Ginsberg
Cindy Robertson

**Engineering
Ventures**

Nik Fiore

**Fitzgerald &
Halliday, Inc.**

Stephanie Dyer-
Carroll

Hartgen

Walter Wheeler

HDR

Jim Murphy

Quantum

Construction

Lisa Martin
Niki Polish

McFarland Johnson

Vicki Chase
Gene McCarthy

Normandeau

Jameson Paine

Preservation

Consultant

Elizabeth Hengen

Consulting

Parties/Other

Mark Ciborowski
James Garvin
Allan Herschlag
Audra Klum
Lee Richmond
Roy Schweiker

(When viewing these minutes online, click on an attendee to send an e-mail)

PROJECTS/PRESENTATIONS REVIEWED THIS MONTH:

(minutes on subsequent pages)

| | |
|--|----|
| <u>November 7, 2013</u> | 2 |
| Merrimack, 13923, X-A000(626) | 2 |
| Portsmouth, 13455, STP-X-5379(025) | 2 |
| Rochester, 27873, X-A003(650) | 5 |
| Concord, 23717, X-A002(742) | 5 |
| <u>November 14, 2013</u> | 7 |
| Concord, 12004, BRF-X-5099(021) | 7 |
| Farmington, 16212, X-A001(192)..... | 10 |

| | |
|---|----|
| Farmington, 16146, X-A001(152)..... | 10 |
| New Castle-Rye, 16127, X-A001(146) | 11 |
| Manchester, 16016, X-A001(086)..... | 14 |
| Hanover 68045B (Hanover Mobility Hub) | 16 |

(When viewing these minutes online, click on a project to zoom to the minutes for that project)

November 7, 2013

Merrimack, 13923, X-A000(626)

Participants: Lisa Martin, Niki Polish, Quantum Construction Consultants

Initial consultation on the proposed bridge replacement of a structurally deficient jack arch bridge in the Town of Merrimack and to identify any historical or archaeological concerns that regulatory agencies may have regarding the project.

The Town of Merrimack, New Hampshire (Town) is proposing the replacement of McGaw Bridge Road over Baboosic Brook (NHDOT Bridge No. 116/137, NHDOT Project No. 13923) due to structural deficiency. The existing bridge structure was constructed in 1940 and is a 23-foot span, 31-foot wide jack arch bridge, founded on concrete abutments. The bridge is in poor condition and is on the NHDOT municipal redlist. QCC proposes to replace the existing bridge with a precast voided slab bridge with an approximate span of 40 feet. The project will include the removal of the existing bridge, substructure and wing walls; disturbance of abutting wetland areas for demolition; and channel armoring for construction of the new replacement structure.

NHDHR requested that a Phase IA Archaeological Sensitivity Assessment study be performed for the project. Individual Inventory Forms also need to be completed for the existing bridge as well as the 1901 property located at 15 Wire Road. There are remaining 1950 vintage homes in the vicinity of the project on the north and northeast side. NHDHR would like the area to be researched to determine if the homes are part of a 1950 subdivision and how it may relate to the bridge. Once the determination has been made as to whether or not a subdivision exists, QCC will follow up with Cultural Resource Committee to determine the next course of action. Preliminary discussions included the possibility of a Small Historic District or Individual Inventory Forms, pending the outcome of QCC's historic consultant's review of the area.

Portsmouth, 13455, STP-X-5379(025)

Participants: John Butler, Bob Landry, Marc Laurin, Ron Crickard, NHDOT; Juliet Walker, City of Portsmouth; Ken Herrick, Albacore Park & Portsmouth Submarine Memorial Association; Vicki Chase, McFarland Johnson; on phone - Richard Candee, Portsmouth Historical Society; and Cassandra Chase, Maine FHWA

Continued consultation to discuss mitigation options associated with the adverse effect determination for potential diminished visitor experience due to the creation and formalization of the Albacore Connector Road.

J. Butler provided a brief review of the construction that would occur to formalize the temporary Connector Road as a City street. Improvements will include:

- a pedestrian crossing of Market Street
- removal of the sidewalk on the south side of the bridge to provide a 5-foot shoulder that would accommodate bicycle travel
- extending the sidewalk on the north side from Market Street to the Albacore Park driveway
- pavement overlay with minor drainage improvements, including constructing a catch basin on the west side to direct drainage under the road and away from the USS Albacore basin
- replacing guardrail and the temporary signals, and
- removing the Jersey barriers.

He noted that the proposed action has many positives including fully directional access to and from the Bypass, improved bicycle and pedestrian access. Juliet Walker stated that the bicycle and pedestrian access would tie into the City's Market Street Gateway plans. It was agreed to research FHWA's current best practices when accommodating bicycles lanes into design.

Ken Herrick asked about the possibility of filling in the wetland pocket located along the west side of the road in order to provide more opportunities for landscaping. Marc Laurin replied that even though a wetland permit would be required for the roadway improvements, the DES Wetlands Bureau would not permit impacts beyond those that were necessary to construct the improvements. There may also be invasive species (purple loosestrife) in the area.

Jill Edelman reviewed the mitigation options brainstormed by NHDOT for discussion.

1. Naming of the Connector Road. L. Black stated that DHR would not consider this as historic mitigation. K. Herrick stated that the Portsmouth Submarine Memorial Association (PSMA) Board would want to keep their Market Street address and have no preference for any names. This would be a City of Portsmouth matter.
2. Updating Existing signage. K. Herrick felt it was a purchase and sale (ROW) issue and stated that Paul McEachern of the PSMA, will be coordinating signing issues with DOT. He understands that the board would not want to move the existing entrance sign from Market Street location. J. Walker stated that any signs should conform to the City standards and suggested that wayfinding signs would be appropriate mitigation. L. Black and Jamie Sikora agreed.
3. Old US1 Bypass entrance removal. K. Herrick agreed that could be historic mitigation and would expect that DOT coordinate with the PMSA on the extent of pavement that would remain within the Park. L. Black agreed that this would enhance the back end and benefit the park, but would not be part of historical mitigation that should complement the setting, feeling and association that is key to the National Historic Landmark. Additional mitigation that address the front end impacts would be needed.
4. Landscaping. K. Herrick felt that this was a ROW issue and should be addressed during the purchase and sale. Any plantings would need to be restricted in height to maintain the water view from the Park and that landscaping take into account a future driveway into the northwest corner of the Park, where the future museum is planned. L. Black would consider this part of impact minimization.
5. Self-guided tour upgrade. This effort would need to be researched further but the intention would be to bring the tour audio system up to current standards. R. Candee was supportive of this mitigation and encouraged thinking about incorporating technological advances, such as QR Codes, and linking into the City web site or Wayfinding plan. L. Black agreed

that this upgrade of the tour system was suitable mitigation. J. Edelmann stated this effort would enhance the system, not replace the existing tour information.

- o K. Herrick stated that the Friends of Albacore are in the process of undertaking an oral history project. He wondered if this could be funded as a mitigation effort and asked if funds from this mitigation could be directly applied to these efforts. J. Sikora replied that this could be possible, but would need to be more of a reimbursement for approved tasks, rather than a disbursement of funds to the organization. J. Edelmann stated that to be mitigation this would need to be a benefit to the public and help enhance the visitor experience and could possibly be tied in with the self-guided tour upgrade. L. Black recommended investigating and confirming the appropriate manner in which the final product could be distributed to the public. Ken Herrick indicated PSMA wanted to sell the oral history product. L. Black noted that in her past experience the product had to be distributed free of charge for a certain number of copies as part of the public benefit of mitigation. The Naval Archives might be issued a copy. Then the community was welcome to print and sell beyond that.
 - o Jack Hunter, Friends of the Albacore, has previously completed a grant proposal for portions of this effort. Ken Herrick has agreed to provide a copy of the grant proposal to the committee.
6. Extending the visitor's experience along the new sidewalk to Market Street. J. Walker suggested that interpretive signs in the planned park across Market Street could also be developed and tied to Albacore Park. L. Black agreed that this is a viable option to look into further. K. Herrick stated that anything to support the Albacore Park is a good idea.

K. Herrick stated his disagreement of the Maine-NH bridges connections having been separated into three projects, with the Connector Road being a small project with fewer funds for mitigation available. The PSMA Board wants full appropriate historic mitigation done under the Connector Road project that would also take the Sarah Mildred Long (SML) impacts in consideration.

K. Herrick felt that appropriate mitigation for the overall effects to the Albacore is the upgrade of the Albacore basin, with consideration of one of the options outlined in the UNH study. It was stated that all options essentially replicate a dry dock around the Albacore, which would be historically appropriate and in keeping with the submarines character defining features as the Albacore spent 50% of its time in dry dock. R. Landry added that the Department may be willing to fund portions of the dry dock. J. Sikora added that this would require PSMA seeking reimbursement from NHDOT for the work done up to the agreed upon amount.

K. Herrick reiterated his opinion that the SML impacts constitute an Adverse Effect. Cassandra Chase stated that the Determination of Effect for the SML has not yet been finalized and will be sent to the NHDHR and consulting parties within the next couple of weeks. L. Black feels that the SML effects should not be incorporated into the Connector Road mitigation. K. Herrick replied that impact on the view shed of the Albacore from the SML needs to come to a conclusion as soon as possible.

K. Herrick requested that a formal response to the PSMA's Adverse Effect discussion for the Connector Road has not been received from FHWA. J. Sikora stated that the Effects memo was sent to the Advisory Council and that this decision took into account their comments. K. Herrick would prefer a formal acknowledgment addressing their comments.

J. Edlmann will send out a summary of the mitigation options remaining for the Albacore Connector for further discussion at the December 5th Cultural Resource meeting.

Rochester, 27873, X-A003(650)

Participants: Michelle Marshall, Trent Zanes, Cathy Goodman, Ron Crickard, NHDOT

Initial discussion of the need to remove the privately-owned house and retaining wall located at 65 Estes Road in exchange for a sight line easement to improve the intersection with US Route 202. Goal of the meeting was directed at determining an overall effect for the project and possible mitigation efforts. The house was determined individually eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places for its architecture.

C. Goodman presented a power point presentation to review this project. The intersection has a history of 18 traffic accidents from 2002 to 2011, half of which had injuries. The traffic on US Route 202 travels at a high rate of speed at this location and vehicles entering from Estes Road have poor sight distance to determine if a vehicle is approaching. The proposed project will demolish the house; remove a concrete wall and cut brush and trees along the southeast side of US Route 202 to improve the sight distance. This house was built before 1892 and is a knee-wall cape style house. Currently the interior condition is very poor and the house is uninhabitable. Removal of the house and concrete wall along with the trees and brush will greatly improve the sight distance. L. Black requested information regarding moving the building and what could be done without removing the building.

L. Black suggested a mitigation option would be to have the demolition an educational event to show interested parties how houses were constructed in the 19th century. Another option suggested by NHDOT would be to have inventory and documentation of some older rest areas in the state as part of the mitigation. L. Black said that she think a project specific solution would be more acceptable to SHPO. M. Marshall said she think the building structure is too unsound to allow anyone to be inside at any time during demolition and that insurance liability would have to be checked to see who could be on-site during demolition. Measurements to show the sight distance and associated speed limits will be calculated and information regarding the possibility to move the building will be presented at a future meeting.

Concord, 23717, X-A002(742)

Participants: Gene McCarthy, McFarland Johnson; Ed Roberge, City of Concord; Liz Hengen, Preservation Consultant; Tom Jameson, NHDOT; Aaron Ginsberg, Cindy Robertson, Disability Rights Center; Consulting Parties: City of Concord Planning Board & Heritage Commission, Lee Richmond, Mark Ciborowski

Continued consultation and update on project, previously reviewed on August 15, 2013, March 19, 2013, March 14, 2013, February 14, 2013, September 13, 2012 and November 3, 2011. The purpose of the meeting was to present the proposed accessibility improvements for the project since the original MOE was approved in April. Gene McCarthy presented slides and provided hand outs that depicted the proposed improvements. The slides depicted the following modifications:

29 South Main Street (Bread & Chocolate): The sidewalk in front of the entrance will be raised to eliminate the two steps into the building. Portions of the base façade will be covered.

97 North Main Street (Bravo Boutique): A ramp will be constructed to provide access. A portion of the building base will be covered.

103-111 North Main Street (Masiello Group): A ramp will be constructed to provide access. A portion of the building base will be covered.

110 North Main Street (Eagle Hotel): A combination of a raised sidewalk and tilting of the existing granite entrances will provide access. Portions of the existing building facades will be covered. The building management has stated they may upgrade the storefronts at the same time.

25-35 North Main Street (Vision Shoppe): A ramp will be constructed along Warren Street to provide access via a current window. The window will be replaced with a door that will have a dark metal frame. The dark frame is not intended to match the other doors, but to visually imply a void (like a window). Other recommendations were made that constitute a similar disparate treatment.

36-42 North Main Street (Phenix Hall): A raised platform is proposed in front of Phenix Hall to provide access to its four doorways. Portions of the base granite material of the building will be covered. Two sets of steps will be provided to access the platform as well as one ramp for complete accessibility.

Liz Hengen presented updated Determination of Eligibility/Effect Forms (yellow sheets) for each of the properties listed above and for the Concord Downtown Historic District. In all but one case, Phenix Hall, there was a finding of no adverse effect. In the case of Phenix Hall, it was determined the platform in front of the building constitutes an adverse effect.

Laura Black did comment that there were other revisions to the project that were not present when the MOE was approved in April. These include the curvilinear patterns in the sidewalk pavement in certain locations and the rotated clock tower at the Phenix Hall bump out. Laura felt these were not in conformance with the historic linear character of Main Street but would not oppose these revisions since they were introduced to reflect public comments. The conclusion is that the project will now have an overall Adverse Effect due to the Adverse Effect associated with Phenix Hall. A programmatic Section 4(f) will also be required.

A brief discussion of the potential mitigation for the adverse effect on Phenix Hall was begun. Ed Roberge stated the wayfinding plans for the project include thematic kiosks. A kiosk could be placed in the Phenix bump out with a panel on the history and significance of Phenix Hall. Another options discussed was to refurbish the Phenix Hall sign. It was decided the discussion would continue at the next meeting.

It was decided that a new MOE would be required to replace the one approved in April. The design team would prepare the revised MOE and distribute it for review and signature.

November 14, 2013

Concord, 12004, BRF-X-5099(021)

Participants: Martha Drukker, Ed Roberge, City of Concord; Rob Faulkner, CHA: Gene McCarthy, McFarland Johnson; Cathy Goodmen, Tom Jameson, Kevin Nyhan, Steve Liakos, NHDOT; James Garvin, Audra Klum Roy Schweiker, Consulting Parties

Continued discussion on the Sewalls Falls Road Bridge project and mitigation options. Ed Roberge handed out the draft MOA and noted that he would like the group to focus on the stipulations on page two. He then reviewed last month's meeting efforts.

Ed continued with an update on functional/re-use status and indicated that the City was struggling with some of the issues associated with reusing the structure:

- Is it physically possible to move the bridge noting that everything from the deck down needs to be replaced, even for pedestrian use?
- It is estimated that it could cost upwards to one million to re-use.
- Another option would be to build a stand-alone deck and use the trusses as a façade.

Ed continued that they had consulted with a local bridge contractor, Beck & Bellucci, for their input on relocation. While they agreed that portions of the existing bridge structure could be relocated for a short distance, it was further noted that there would be high costs associated with cleaning and painting the structure which would involve removing lead paint.

Ed noted that they evaluated disassembly and relocation of the bridge to at least 10 other locations and found that nothing really fit the span configuration and access would be quite difficult. While some trail locations are preferred over others, the sustainability of the structure has become a concern of City Council.

The City has one example of a Bailey bridge recently dedicated for reuse over the Contoocook River which included a maintenance agreement with the local trail groups. Council approval of the dedication was contingent upon a sustainable maintenance plan in place prior to approval.

In summary, Ed said, given the challenges associated with the functional/re-use option that it is not likely that the City will find a reasonable location, and a sustainable management plan supported by the local community.

Roy Schweiker asked if the wetland crossing along the Merrimack River Greenway Trail (MRGT) at Terrill Park be a good spot for the bridge. Ed Roberge responded that the effort would be costly and preliminary review of environmental impacts with NHDES concluded that a helical screw pier supported boardwalk would be best to minimize impacts to wetlands in the area. The majority of the costs associated with the relocation would likely need to be borne by City Council, which the MRGT project is not funded at this time. He then asked if FHWA was able to provide any funds.

To further explore creative uses of the bridge, Ed further noted that City staff even approached a local developer to evaluate whether they could incorporate the truss bridge structure into a building project, but concluded that it was not a reasonable option.

Ed Roberge indicated that staff met with the Concord Heritage Commission to review mitigation options. The commission expressed concern with the practicality and safety of a static monument and does not support that option. The commission did indicate that mitigation should be “expressed” in the proposed bridge design.

There was further discussion regarding the static monument, which included reference to Boscawen’s struggle with work on relocation of the existing bridge and the issues that they were having with the logistics of disassembly and cost.

The City also reached out to Maine and Vermont DOT’s and found no examples of re-use.

Ed continued stating that marketing the bridge will go beyond just posting it in the paper. The City could store the bridge for a certain extended period of time. He further noted that the truss is the only marketable piece and that a timeline and other details would be refined in the final MOA.

Other mitigation ideas included HAER documentation as well as developing and placing an interpretive signs at an agreed location which could include the community center or other facility in the City such as the Smile Building.

The granite blocks from the existing substructure could be used for a small retaining wall at the proposed bridge or as blocks for a “granite walking plaza” by the bridge with an inset for photos along the walking path. They could also be used as fascia blocks on the new substructure but may pose maintenance problems with potential separation. These ideas were supported by the Concord Heritage Commission.

In addition, the railroad signal box at the eastern project limits will need to be relocated and the archeologically sensitive areas would be fenced off during construction.

Ed mentioned lastly that there could also be some educational elements as well as GIS links on the City’s website.

Jill Edelmann had some initial comments on the draft MOA and noted that it was not the mitigation package but the background working document.

Roy Schweiker commented that the greatest expense of the panel sign will be the design and not the construction and felt that the City should consider multiple locations. He further stated that he was impressed with the effort put forth by the City but felt that the City was being stingy with money compared to the financial costs associated with environmental mitigation. He noted that he felt that more money should be appropriated to re-use in the order of 20% of the savings between alternatives 8 and H.

Roy also mentioned the swamp crossing at Terrill Park as a location where the bridge could be disassembled and re-assembled to become a narrow bridge for pedestrians which would reduce loads. He further stated that a pedestrian bridge would also give people the opportunity to actually look at the bridge and that the span could be longer than the crossing. He also commented that there had not been a public hearing since the original hearing during which Alternate H was selected.

Jamie Sikora said the FHWA would fund 80% of the demolition cost, which is currently estimated at \$500,000, towards mitigation.

Ed Roberge said that not only costs would be a concern of City Council but the lack of a project management and maintenance plan would make the option not practical.

Roy Schweiker commended that he did not like the idea of using the bridge as a “false truss” and instead, felt that a place for the bridge could be found and it could be a tourist attraction. He also suggested setting up a “historic bridge park” that could be used for mitigation for other projects.

Jim Garvin read a statement from Consulting Party, Nathan Holth where he stated that he felt that the bridge could be removed and relocated for +/- \$500,000. He cited the example of the Erie Canal Relocation. Jim will forward the email to Jill Edelman who will distribute the group.

Jim added that he agrees with Roy that the best re-use is in the City of Concord for transportation use, pedestrian or vehicular. He then asked if the bridge couldn't be kept in Concord, can mitigation money be funneled to other projects.

Jamie Sikora responded that he could not answer that question at this point.

Jim continued noting several bridges that could use money for preservation and also noted that he does not necessarily support a “faux” re-use. He then asked if the south span of the bridge could be relocated to a location near the bridge as an educational benefit of being able to view the bridge near the original location.

Ed Roberge asked what the preservation standards were for FHWA participation and would a portion of the truss span be acceptable for re-use or display, and eligible for project funds. Jamie Sikora indicated he would review that question.

Roy Schweiker responded that it would be better than nothing.

Audra Klumb said she agreed with Jim's and Roy's support of trying to re-use the bridge for recreational purposes.

Ed Roberge stated that if the bridge was stored by the City that he didn't think it would market well, as the only salvageable portion of the bridge were the truss sections.

Ed also noted that in response to comments regarding funding of other projects outside of the Concord community, he thought it was important to focus mitigation of the loss of a community element within the Concord community.

To summarize today's discussions, Ed indicated that he would forward the draft MOA to attendees and to Nathan Holth for review and comment, particularly those items on the draft document that didn't generate much discussion at the meeting.

Farmington, 16212, X-A001(192)**Participants: Cathy Goodmen, Nancy Spaulding, Mike Dugas, NHDOT**

Initial consultation for a project on NH Route 11 just south of the intersection with NH Route 153. An RPR form was submitted in 2011. Cathy Goodmen and Nancy Spaulding presented this project to widen NH Route 11 for approximately 3800 feet south of the intersection with Main Street, and to add a center dedicated left turn lane. This roadway has had several accidents related to turning off NH Route 11 or turning onto NH Route 11, including one fatality. Also, a centerline rumble strip will be added from the southerly end of the center turn lane, southward to the Rochester Town line.

There are several houses along NH Route 11 that could be historic. Most of these will only be impacted by driveway easements, or slope easements along the roadway. Cathy showed photos of some of these, but Laura Black noted that the RFP from 2011 did not have these photos or a plan to locate them. She suggested that NHDOT provide copies of these for SHPO review and then she would let us know if we needed to present this again. Cathy and Nancy agreed and on Nov 19th they provided a hard copy of the photos and a plan with the houses identified with small photos. Further consultation will occur after SHPO reviews these plans and photos.

Farmington, 16146, X-A001(152)**Participants: Christine Perron, Bob Landry, Ron Kleiner, NHDOT; JoAnn Fryer, CLD Engineers; Jamie Paine, Normandeau**

Jameson Paine provided a brief project update. The NHDOT proposes to replace the bridge (State Bridge No. 096/140) that carries NH Route 153 (Main Street) over the Cocheco River, just south of downtown Farmington, NH. The road serves as a major route for vehicles entering the City from the south. This structure, a 48-foot two-span concrete girder bridge with a concrete deck, was built in 1924.

The area is fairly urban in nature, with a manufacturing facility, former gas station, a large multi-family structure and several other residential structures nearby. Under a 1950's era Army Corps of Engineers project, the section of Cocheco River located immediately upstream from the project was reconstructed to create a flood levee system. A former mill building on the northeast quadrant burned down in the 1970's and an associated canal in the area was backfilled.

CULTURAL RESOURCE REVIEWS

Upon review of the NHDHR Request for Project Review (RPR), NHDHR staff requested that Individual Inventory Forms be completed for the subject bridge, 343 Main Street, and 5 Canal Street. It was also requested that a Phase IA, and if warranted, a Phase IB archaeological assessment be completed.

Historic Resources

Individual inventory forms were prepared by Ms. Lisa Mausolf for the three resources provided above. It was determined that:

- 5 Canal Street property was not eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (National Register).
- The subject bridge is eligible for the National Register due to its engineering significance.
- The 343 Main Street property does not meet eligibility for individual listing in the National Register due to physical changes to the building. However, it was requested that additional photographs and a brief evaluation be provided to help the Determination of Eligibility (DOE) Committee decide whether or not the property contributes to a potential historic district at this location.

The project proposes removal of the existing bridge, therefore, a Summary of Alternatives was prepared and presented by the project team to evaluate rehabilitation and bypass options.

Archaeological Resources

A combined Phase IA and IB report was completed for the project. The report by Independent Archaeological Consulting, LLC recommended that no further archaeological survey be completed for the project. NHDHR concurred with the recommendation. No further archaeological work is warranted.

CULTURAL RESOURCE AGENCY INPUT -

Concern was raised over the removal of the existing bridge, as it has been deemed eligible. CLD provided additional discussion to supplement the Summary of Alternatives, with regards to the feasibility of maintaining any portion of the superstructure. It was requested that the Summary be updated to include additional information regarding the viability of rehabilitation vs. removal.

Due to the need for additional information for the 343 Main Street property, it was agreed to have L. Mausolf provide the necessary materials for DOE Committee review prior to the provision of formal determination of effect.

New Castle-Rye, 16127, X-A001(146)

Participants: Stephanie Dyer-Carroll, Fitzgerald & Halliday; Jim Murphy, HDR; Victoria Chase, Bob Landry, Marc Laurin, NHDOT

Continued discussion and update on the design of the Rehabilitation and Replacement options for the New Castle-Rye Bridge and potential mitigation in order to develop the Effects Memo and MOA.

The second coordination meeting with SHPO on the New Castle-Rye Bridge Project was held on November 14, 2013 at NHDOT. Attendees introduced themselves and a brief presentation was provided on the status of the project.

Bob Landry with NHDOT provided a brief summary of the project to date. He explained that an Inspection and Condition Report for the bridge was completed in 2011. In 2012, Project Team developed four potential alternatives for the rehabilitation or replacement of the bridge. Two of these alternatives, the rehabilitation of the bridge and the replacement of the bridge on the existing alignment with another bascule bridge, are still under consideration.

Stephanie Dyer-Carroll, a Planner and Cultural Resources Specialist with FHI, then provided a summary of the public involvement process to date. In early 2013, a Project Advisory Committee (PAC) was established and two PAC meetings have occurred, one in January and one in July of 2013. A Public Information Meeting was held on August 14, 2013. All the residents of New Castle and more than 100 residents of Rye were notified of the meeting through a postcard. Through an interactive polling exercise at the meeting it was determined that: the majority of the public would prefer a bascule bridge, regardless of the alternative selected; the public would like the construction to occur in the winter to minimize impacts to the community including the Wentworth By the Sea Hotel; the majority of the public prefers a solid deck over an open deck; the public prefers locating the sidewalk on the east side of the bridge due to safety concerns; and an overwhelming majority supports the replacement of the bridge on the existing alignment.

Jim Murphy, a Project Manager with HDR, Inc., provided a brief summary of the condition of the bridge. He explained that a bridge inspection was undertaken in 2011 that determined the bridge has structural deficiencies including advanced section loss in the pier caps and piles, the stringers and bascule girders, and the approach span stringers. Additional deficiencies include the fact that the bascule machinery doesn't meet code, the sidewalks and shoulders are narrow, and the open deck is noisy and a hazard to bicyclists. Furthermore, there are safety issues as pedestrians must cross the road on the north roadway approach to use the bridge's sidewalk. Finally, the bridge does not meet current load requirements. When the bridge was constructed in the 1940s, it was designed to handle trucks weighing up to 20 tons; modern standards require bridges support 36 ton trucks plus additional loads.

Murphy stated that, based on the analysis conducted to date, if the Rehabilitation Alternative were to be pursued nearly every member on the bridge would require replacement. This includes new piles, primary load bearing members, bridge rails, the trunnion pin and the electrical system. As such, the project would essentially be constructing a replica of the existing bridge, as only a handful of the piles supporting the piers would remain out of the entire structure. In addition, this alternative would not allow the relocation of the sidewalk to the east side of the bridge, a key concern of residents due to pedestrian safety. The Rehabilitation Alternative would not impact private properties or the large Amur Cork tree on the Rye side of the bridge. This alternative attempts to adhere as much as physically possible to the 1994 Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) prepared for the Scammel Bridge, which committed to maintain the New Castle-Rye Bridge as historic mitigation for the replacement of the Scammel Bridge and to only replace it under exceptional circumstances. This alternative does not fully adhere to the MOA, however, and it would likely result in an adverse effect under Section 106. This Alternative would have a life cycle cost in the order of \$43 million over 75 years. Murphy also stated that the Rehabilitation

Alternative would require a substantially longer bridge closure for construction. While details and staging are not finalized Murphy estimated that the closure could be as long as 9 months.

The Replacement Alternative would utilize a bascule span, thereby maintaining two bascule bridges within the state. The profile of the bridge would be similar to the existing profile and would thus preserve the existing aesthetic along with the sizing and massing of the existing structure. Furthermore, it would allow for the relocation of the sidewalk to the east side of the bridge, wider shoulders, and a scenic overlook. Different options for the Operator's House are being investigated, including a structure similar to the existing one and another that draws design features from the Wentworth by the Sea Hotel. Like the Rehabilitation Alternative, the Replacement Alternative would not impact the large Amur Cork Tree on the Rye side of the bridge, nor would it impact private properties. The bridge would have a life cycle cost in the order of \$27 million over its 75-year life span, substantially less than the Rehabilitation Alternative. Murphy stated that the Replacement Alternative would allow for accelerated construction techniques such as used on the Memorial Bridge by floating in the superstructure, minimizing bridge closure time. The closure is estimated to be 3 months for the Replacement Alternative and could be completed outside of the heavy tourist summer months.

Murphy shared that, based on the investigations to date, the potential costs, and the input received from the public, the Rehabilitation Alternative is not looking feasible or prudent. However, a final determination will be made following the completion of the Type, Size and Location Report in December. After completion of the December Report, a PAC meeting and a Public Information Meeting will be held early in 2014 and a Determination of Effect will be prepared and submitted to SHPO. NHDOT anticipates that the 30% design will be completed by July 2014.

Throughout the meeting, attendees asked questions and offered information or concerns. The comments and questions were as follows:

- SHPO stated that FHWA needs to address Stipulation 2 within the MOA for the Scammel Bridge. This stipulation states that FHWA and NHDOT committed to the long-term maintenance and preservation of the New Castle-Rye Bridge and that the bridge would only be replaced under exceptional circumstances, including a natural disaster creating a severe safety hazard or other unforeseen circumstance. Similar language was included in the Vilas Bridge MOA. SHPO provided no indication whether Replacement was acceptable given the extensive nature of what Rehabilitation would require.
- NHDOT pointed out that the language is not consistent between the MOA for the Scammel Bridge and a June 24, 1994 letter from NHDOT Commissioner Charles O'Leary to NHDHR. In addition to replacement due to a natural disaster, the letter mentions prohibitive cost as a potential factor in determining whether the bridge would be maintained.
- SHPO stated that it is important to let the public know about the MOA for the Scammel Bridge. Bob Landry indicated that this had been done at the last public meeting repeatedly during the discussion of the alternatives.
- SHPO indicated that FHWA/NHDOT should document how the bridge was maintained and why it needs to be replaced. If there is a Determination of Adverse Effect, FHWA will consult with ACHP to determine their involvement in the process. Edna Feighner emphasized that the 1994 MOA needs to be addressed first.
- FHWA stated that they were not sure how much funding was used for repairs over the last 20 years. NHDOT indicated that substantial rehabilitation/repairs had been done over this time in an

effort to maintain the bridge. NHDOT agreed to research what work was done on the bridge between 1994 and 2013 and share this with SHPO.

- FHWA asked whether NHDOT solicited consulting parties in the process. The project team indicated that a flyer was made available at the public meeting in August that explained how one could become a consulting party. In addition, the process was explained by the consultant team and the public was directed to members of the project team with any questions.
- NHDOT stated that the consultant team has undertaken substantial public outreach throughout the process. They further indicated that public comments focused on safety, the importance of a solid deck, and the need to avoid lengthy bridge closures especially during the summer months which are the busiest for the area. The public also requested a vote be taken to determine support for the various alternatives. The vast majority of the meeting attendees supported the replacement of the bridge on the same alignment. No attendees supported the rehabilitation of the bridge. A small minority supported the replacement offline to maintain access into New Castle at all times.
- SHPO asked how the Public Advisory Committee (PAC) was formed. The project team indicated that they began with a core list of individuals, including a representative from the local historical society, adjacent property owners, local representatives, and the Wentworth by the Sea Hotel. The list was expanded through talking to these individuals.
- SHPO asked whether the Operator's House was original. The project team indicated that it was designed after the construction of the bridge. Further investigation determined that the Operator House was constructed in 1962. The bridge was constructed in 1942.
- Regarding the design of the Operator's House, SHPO stated that it should not mimic adjacent properties, as this contradicts the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. Instead, it should be sensitive to the surrounding area and consistent with the overall design of the new bridge.
- The consultant team asked whether the proportions of the Operator's House needed to be maintained, as the necessary expansion of the footprint would require that the Operator's House be fairly tall. SHPO indicated that the proportions do not need to be maintained.
- SHPO asked that both the minutes from this meeting and the Powerpoint presentation be placed on the project website. NHDOT agreed to this request.
- The project team asked whether SHPO had any input on the design of the Northeast Extreme Tee beams (NEXT Beams - concrete tee beams). SHPO did not express an opinion.

Manchester, 16016, X-A001(086)

Participants: Heidi J. Marshall, Kelsey Gagnon, CLD; Bruce Thomas, Tim Clougherty, Todd Connors, City of Manchester; Bob Hudson, NHDOT

Continued discussion and review of plans. The goal of the meeting will be to review impacts along Elm Street from the sidewalk reconstruction. This review will take into account the recent Project Area Form that was submitted for the project, along with any Phase IA results.

Heidi Marshall, P.E. of CLD Consulting Engineers, Inc., presented the Project on behalf of the City of Manchester. The project was presented as follow up to the request for further investigation of the historic and cultural nature of the project. The project was previously presented to the Committee by Jamie Paine of CLD as a larger overall project scope in 2008, and then again in December 2011 by Michael Haley of CLD as a smaller scope. As requested at the 2011 meeting, a Project Area Form for the entire original project area was completed, as well as a Phase IA Archaeological Sensitivity Assessment Study for the current project scope area. The current project scope is limited to the Elm Street corridor bounded by Old Granite Street to Valley Street and is anticipated to consist of sidewalk improvements, American Disability Act (ADA) compliant sidewalk tip downs, roadway resurfacing, installation of tree wells, potential installation of some pedestrian level lighting along Elm Street and addition of two archways at the entrance of the Gaslight District over the intersections of Depot and Elm Street and Franklin and Old Granite.

In addition to sidewalk and overlay improvements, tree wells are proposed (likely as an add-alternate) on the east side of Elm Street, south of Auburn Street to reflect similar landscaping constructed by the new Market Basket. Existing cobra head lighting is likely to remain with consideration of additional low level pedestrian lighting. Drainage improvements are limited to adjusting pavement grades to drain to existing drainage structures along Elm Street. The catch basin and pedestrian signal at the intersection of Green and Elm Street are no longer proposed as part of the current scope. Temporary easements will likely be necessary on the west side of Elm Street to reconstruct portions of the sidewalk; however, no permanent easements are proposed.

The following were key discussion points:

1. L. Black inquired as to which buildings might be impacted, that were identified by Preservation Company, as being likely to contribute to a potential district. H. Marshall noted buildings 494 Elm Street, 542-550 Elm Street, and 560 Elm Street; would have the potential for greatest impact, but none are planned to be impacted. (494 Elm will require ADA sidewalk ramp construction coordination, 542-550 has had recent “modern” ramp work performed in the City right-of-way, and 560 sits at the rear of the parcel, with parking near the front.)
2. J. Edelmann wondered if there were intentions of touching any of the ramps leading into the existing building at 542-550 Elm Street. CLD and the City noted that it is not our intention to touch any of the raised portion used to enter the building and only to replace sidewalk around these ramps.
3. J. Edelmann noted the concern with the grading of the sidewalks and any potential effect of the architectural history at the base of the existing building where the sidewalk meets the façade of the building. CLD and City do not intend to change the grade of the sidewalk at the face of any buildings. The City has recently completed a sidewalk project in another area of the Elm Street and the grades at the frontages of the building remained relatively unchanged.
4. L. Black inquired whether there would be any driveway grading alterations due to construction. H. Marshall noted the only new grading that is proposed is to meet ADA compliance for the cross-slope of the sidewalk. B. Hudson questioned how the grade was going to be made up in the sidewalk and whether the curb reveal would need to be changed. CLD is considering leaving some of the curb as is so money can be used to replace more sidewalk within the area. If the curb is to be replaced, the curb reveal area will likely be used to make up any required differences. The current curb reveals vary significantly in the proposed scope of work area. Most driveways do not have curb in front of them.

5. H. Marshall noted that there may be grading challenges in the front of the 516 Elm Street Parcel that was identified by Preservation Company as “retain some integrity but have been altered”. There is an existing underground basement area that extends out in front of the building on this parcel accessed by a garage door on Depot Street. The only regrading will be to reconstruct the sidewalks to be ADA cross-slope compliant, which may cause the driveway of this parcel to have a slightly steeper grade. We will not be directly impacting any portion of the structure. CLD will raise the grade of Elm Street before an underground area is touched.
5. There are some areas that could use some pedestrian “control” in lieu of a traditional sidewalk or cross-walk. For example, CLD and the City have discussed the possibility of doing a colored/textured-style sidewalk in areas such as in front of Meineke and a similar treatment for the crosswalks at Depot Street and Franklin on the way into the Gaslight District.
6. H. Marshall noted that the previously proposed pedestrian crossing and catch basin at the intersection of Green and Elm Street is no longer being considered as part of the current scope.
7. An archeologist will be available to consult when tree wells are being dug if the contractor were to uncover anything. CLD and the City do not anticipate any problems with this as nothing was identified during the Market Basket construction.
8. L. Black noted concern for cobble stone areas that are known to exist in the Gaslight District. CLD noted that these areas are not proposed to be touched at this time. L. Black also noted documentation of historic fire hydrants. The City confirmed there were none in the current project area. L. Black noted to verify that no historic fire hydrants or cobble stone areas are to be impacted. If any are found in the limits of work, be sure to use the Project Area Form to aid in the design around these elements.
10. L. Black / J. Edelmann noted that the current project area consist mainly of warehouse buildings. Further design should complement the surrounding buildings.

Agencies concurred on a determination of No Adverse Effect as long as there are no substantial grade changes impacting building elements. No architectural details of building façade should be disturbed at the base of the building from sidewalk reconstruction. Lastly, an archeologist must be available during excavation efforts of the tree wells in the event something is encountered.

Hanover 68045B (Hanover Mobility Hub)

Participants: Nik Fiore, Engineering Ventures; Via Telephone: Peter Kulbacki, Don Ware, City of Hanover; Joanna Whitcomb, Dartmouth College; Walter Wheeler, Hartgen;

Continued consultation on Hanover Mobility Hub (NHDOT Grant NH-04-0003) and APE boundary determinations.

- 1.0 The intent of this meeting was to establish an Area of Potential Effect for the Section 106 review process.
- 2.0 Meeting opened with a review of previously distributed photographs of the Mobility Hub site and looking at the site from the Dartmouth Green taken after the leaves had fallen from the trees along Wheelock Street. Photographs also included Google street view images from 2012 showing

the grassed part of the Hopkins Center plaza being used as a staging area for renovations to the Hannover Inn and from 2010 prior to that takeover. N Fiore gave a brief recap of the concept plan stating that bus shelters would be located in the same area previously used for construction staging. J Whitcomb stated that Dartmouth is a supporting partner with the Town and will be involved with design decision making. She also stated that plans are in the works of major renovations to Hopkins Center and Hood Museum. Renovations may include site changes to the plaza.

- 3.0 L Black stated that the APE is to be created independent of knowledge about potential historical resources. Typically the APE is defined by the area that may be affected visually, atmospherically, by the project's construction, and/or by noise impacts. Other considerations also apply.
- 4.0 After some discussion it was generally agreed that the APE for this project would be the area with a clear view of the Mobility Hub site. The APE is generally described as including the plaza in front of Hopkins Center, the spaces internal to Hopkins Center and Hanover Inn overlooking the plaza, Dartmouth Green, the four streets around Dartmouth Green, and the "front yards" of the buildings around Dartmouth Green. It was generally agreed that once inside the buildings around Dartmouth Green (save Hopkins Center and Hanover Inn) views of the Mobility Hub site were sufficiently obscured to exclude them from the APE. N Fiore will draw the APE on a clean map and distribute.
- 5.0 The discussion then turned to determining what documentation is necessary to move project design and Section 106 consultation forward. L Black recommended looking at Dartmouth College as a potential Historic District with added emphasis on the APE. J Edelmann asked if the college had ever looked into such a thing and J Whitcomb stated that have not and that there isn't real interest in doing so. J Whitcomb did state that the college has an inventory of buildings, but not to a National Register level of detail. There are no College owned building listed on the NR.
- 6.0 J Edelmann passed on two comments from S Sullivan. 1) It's likely that all building around the APE would be considered contributing, so maybe the project can move ahead with the assumption that they all are. 2) The immediate project site has seen a fair amount of change in recent years and it should not be considered a static piece of property during the review process. J Whitcomb agreed that most of the campus would likely be contributing.
- 7.0 L Black stated that under Section 106 the conditions within the contributing area must be documented in order to make informed design decisions. What are the character-defining features of the area? Should use an

understanding of these character-defining features to both sensitively design the project (so as to avoid or minimize) adverse effects, and to make an informed determination of effect for the proposed design of the project.

- 8.0 Concerns were raised that a large scale look at the campus as a whole for Historic District consideration would be well beyond the budget of the project. A suggestion was made for the use of a “hybrid” form. After continued discussion it was generally agreed that the important elements to document are those that define the character of the APE. These include, but not necessarily limited to, building façades, building architectural style, landscaping treatments, hardscape treatments, and other elements that contribute to the overall context of the APE. It was decided that the historical reviews or inventories of the surrounding buildings would not be need. N Fiore will compile the full criteria and scope for this level of documentation and distribute for review and concurrence. J Whitcomb will also provide Dartmouth’s design review guidelines.

Submitted by: Sheila Charles and Jill Edelman, Cultural Resources

<http://www.nh.gov/dot/org/projectdevelopment/environment/units/technicalservices/crmeetings.htm>